	N472BahS kjc	
1	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK	
2	X	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	New York, N.Y.
4	v.	21 Cr. 430 (RA)
5	NILOUFAR BAHADORIFAR,	
6	Defendant.	
7	x	Sentencing
8		April 7, 2023 10:05 a.m.
9		10.05 a.m.
10	Before:	
11	HON. RONNIE ABRAMS,	
12		District Judge
13		
14	APPEARANCES	
15	DAMIAN WILLIAMS	,
16	United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York	
17	BY: JACOB H. GUTWILLIG  MATTHEW HELLMAN	
18	Assistant United States Attorney	'S
19	LAW OFFICES OF JEFFREY LICHTMAN	
20	Attorneys for Defendant	
21	BY: JEFFREY H. LICHTMAN JEFFREY B. EINHORN	
22		
23		
24		
25		

(Case called)

THE DEPUTY CLERK: Counsel, please state your name for the record.

MR. GUTWILLIG: Good morning, your Honor. Jacob Gutwillig for the government. I'm joined at counsel table by my colleague AUSA Matthew Hellman.

THE COURT: Good morning to both of you.

MR. LICHTMAN: Jeffrey Lichtman and Jeffrey Einhorn for defendant Niloufar Bahadorifar.

THE COURT: Good morning to all of you, as well.

So this matter is on for sentencing. Ms. Bahadorifar pled guilty in December to conspiring to violate International Emergency Economic Powers Act, the IEEPA, as we call it, in violation of 50 United States Code 1701 and structuring in violation of 31 United States Code 5324.

So in connection with today's proceeding, I have reviewed all of the numerous letters submitted by the parties, some with attachments, all of which I have read as well, together with a presentence investigation report dated March 7 of this year.

Why don't we begin by discussing the presentence report prepared by the probation department. Counsel, have you reviewed the presentence report and discussed it with your client? Let me start with defense counsel, please.

MR. LICHTMAN: I have, your Honor.

Thev

N472BahS kjc

24

25

1 THE COURT: And do you have any objections to it? 2 MR. LICHTMAN: Judge, we have no objections but, you know, there is the issue with regard to the sentencing 3 4 guidelines, and we would defer to the plea agreement. 5 THE COURT: Okay. All right. Understood. Thank you. 6 I was going ask if you wanted to be heard, but thank you for 7 that. Ms. Bahadorifar, have you had enough time and 8 9 opportunity to review the presentence report and discuss it 10 with your attorneys? 11 THE DEFENDANT: Yes. 12 THE COURT: Okay. Does the government have any 13 objections to the presentence report? 14 MR. GUTWILLIG: Not beyond those with respect to the 15 guidelines calculation, your Honor. THE COURT: Okay. All right. All right. So the 16 17 Court adopts the factual findings in the report. The presentence report will be made a part of the record in this 18 19 matter and placed under seal. If an appeal is taken, counsel 20 on appeal may have access to the sealed report without further application to the Court. 21 22 So, Ms. Bahadorifar, when you pled guilty in 23 December, we discussed the federal sentencing quidelines.

for those who are here and are not aware, the guidelines are,

you know, in a book like this. They are a set of rules.

are published by the United States Sentencing Commission, and they are designed to guide judges when they impose sentence. At one time they were mandatory, meaning judges were required to follow the guidelines, but they are no longer mandatory, they are no longer binding on judges, but judges must nonetheless consider them and calculate them properly.

So while the parties stipulated to a guidelines range of 46 to 57 months, the probation department found that the applicable range should instead be 37 to 46 months. The difference in the ranges turns on whether Counts Two and Five should be grouped or not. The probation department found that they should be, stating that, pursuant to Section 3D1.2, they involve the same victim, namely, society at large, and two or more acts or transactions that are connected by a common criminal objective constituting part of a common scheme or plan.

It seems like defense counsel doesn't want to be heard on this. Would the government like to be heard on this issue further?

MR. GUTWILLIG: Your Honor, the government is happy to rest on its papers unless there are any specific questions we can address.

THE COURT: I don't think so, thanks.

So Section 2M5.1, the guideline applicable to Count Two, is not specifically listed as a guideline to be grouped

under 3D1.2, nor is it listed as a guideline to be excluded from the grouping analysis.

But 3D1.2 provides that for multiple counts of offenses that are not listed, grouping under this subsection may or may not be appropriate and that a case-by-case determination must be made based on facts in the applicable guidelines.

The application note 2 addresses the use of the term "victim" in the guideline and reads, "For offenses in which there are no identifiable victims, e.g., drug or immigration offenses, where society at large is the victim, the 'victim' for purposes of subsection (b) is the societal interest that's harmed."

And the introductory commentary to part 3D of the guidelines makes clear that it is specifically designed to provide incremental punishment for significant additional conduct while preventing multiple punishment for substantially identical conduct.

So ultimately I agree with the government that the societal harms caused by violations of IEEPA and the structuring laws are different and the criminal conduct involved is not substantially identical. The language in 50 United States Code 1701(a) makes clear that IEEPA relates to unusual and extraordinary threats which have their source in whole or in part outside the United States to the national

security, foreign policy, or economy of the United States. You know, in *United States v. Hashimi*, 2009 WL 4042841, Judge Preska collected a history of executive actions taken under the authority of IEEPA, including President Clinton adding Osama Bin Laden and al Qaeda to the list of specially designated terrorists. And as the Second Circuit observed in the *Banki* case, pursuant to IEEPA, the Iranian transactions and sanctions regulations were specifically adopted to target the Iranian government's proliferation of weapons of mass destruction, state-sponsored terrorist activity, and efforts to frustrate Middle East diplomacy.

The structuring laws, by contrast, are principally focused on transparency in the financial system and are designed to fulfill multiple distinct goals. And as far back as 1979, for instance, the Second Circuit described the structuring laws and noted that the reports or records required by them will be useful not only for criminal purposes but also in tax or regulatory investigations or proceedings and that such nonprosecutorial interests accounted for by the laws were substantial. Indeed, Congress specifically codified a declaration of purpose for passing reporting requirements in the structuring laws at 31 United States Code 5311, and there it noted that it enacted the structuring laws to require records that could, among other things, prevent the laundering of money, be used for regulatory investigations, and aid in

combating tax evasion and fraud risks to American financial institutions.

So for all of those reasons, I find that, given the facts of these offenses and the distinct statutory purposes of IEEPA and the structuring laws, that the parties are correct in not grouping Counts Two and Five.

So I accept the guidelines calculation in the plea agreement and I accept the guidelines calculation in the presentence report except for the grouping analysis. As a result, Ms. Bahadorifar's offense level after, among other things, factoring in acceptance points and a minor role reduction, is 23, her criminal history category is I, and her recommended guidelines sentence is 46 to 57 months. So that's consistent with the plea agreement.

As I said a moment ago, that range is only advisory, so courts may impose a sentence outside of that range based on one of two legal concepts—a departure or a variance. A departure allows for a sentence outside of the advisory range based on some provision in the guidelines themselves. I understand that in the plea agreement the parties agreed that neither party could seek a departure. Is that correct?

MR. GUTWILLIG: That's correct, your Honor.

MR. LICHTMAN: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. Nevertheless, I have considered whether there is an appropriate basis for departure from the

advisory guidelines range and, while recognizing that I have the authority to depart, I don't find any grounds warranting a departure under the guidelines.

I also, of course, have the power to impose what we call a variance pursuant to 18 U.S.C. § 3553(a), and I know that that is what the defense is seeking.

So with that said, would the government like to be heard today with respect to sentencing?

MR. GUTWILLIG: Yes, your Honor.

Your Honor, we are here today because Niloufar
Bahadorifar knowingly violated sanctions. Those sanctions are
designed to prevent hostile foreign governments, like Iran,
from carrying out its missions of terror and human rights
abuses across the globe, from stamping out dissent and
silencing criticism and trying to do that right here in New
York City.

Those sanctions are a bulwark against malign foreign actors and influence, and the defendant violated them. For years, she accepted money from Mahmoud Khazein, who she knew was affiliated with Iranian intelligence, and she acted on his behalf. She provided invaluable access, opening the door to the U.S. financial system so that the Iranian intelligence community could walk right through. And on June 17, 2020, at Khazein's direction, and in coordination with their coconspirator Omid Noori, she sent a \$670 payment to a private

investigator. That payment note read: "Requested from Mr. M. Khazein."

Now, as the Court knows, that payment was for the private investigator to conduct surveillance of the victim in this case, Masih Alinejad. She is here in court today.

Ms. Alinejad is a prominent critic of the Iranian regime and she has spoken out against its human rights abuses, compulsory hijab laws, suppression of democratic participation expression, and the use of arbitrary imprisonment, torture, and execution to target its political opponents. And for that bravery she has paid a price. She was, as charged in the indictment, the target of a kidnapping plot undertaken by Khazein, Noori, and their coconspirators, Kiya Sadeghi and Alireza Shahvaroghi Farahani. And you will hear today from Ms. Alinejad about the effect that that kidnapping plot had on her and her family. She will describe it in a way that I can't.

Let me be clear. The defendant is not charged in that kidnapping conspiracy and the government does not allege that she had specific knowledge of its aims. The defendant's conduct is, instead, an object lesson in why sanctions violations are gravely serious. Under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act, or IEEPA, the president has the authority to declare a national emergency with respect to unusual and extraordinary threats to this nation's national

security, foreign policy, and economy when those threats have their source in whole or in substantial part outside of the United States. The government of Iran was identified as such a threat in 1979 when the current regime came to power, seizing the United States embassy in Tehran and holding more than 50 Americans hostage for over a year.

The current sanctions regime came into effect in 1995 when the president declared a national emergency in response to the government of Iran's support of terrorism, among other things. And since that time, each successive U.S. president has found that the government of Iran's actions continue to pose an unusual, extraordinary threat. That is what IEEPA is—a national emergency posed by the government of Iran that has persisted for more than a quarter of a century. That is the law the defendant broke.

She may not have known about the kidnapping conspiracy, but the defendant new very well that she was supporting, assisting, and facilitating the actions of Iranian intelligence assets for years before that plot came to fruition.

Beginning in at least 2014, the defendant received regular payments from Iran from Khazein. Those payments were made through a variety of deceptive and secretive means, and the defendant held up her end of the bargain in exchange. She gave Khazein credit cards, access to the U.S. financial

system, maintained bank accounts, and made payments through U.S. payment facilities. She facilitated import of commodities to Iran, bought computer tools for him, and offered to act as a straw owner of businesses in the United States on his behalf. So even if she never made the payment to the investigator and the kidnapping conspiracy never took place, we would be left with someone who repeatedly, willfully and, to put a fine point on it, dangerously violated sanctions.

Violating sanctions may sound like some sort of technicality. It is not. In plain English, for years, the defendant knowingly supported an intelligence asset of a hostile foreign nation that the United States has deemed a sponsor of global terror.

When she was arrested, the defendant initially lied about knowing Khazein and pretended not to recall his name. She later admitted that in fact she had known him for years and understood him to be connected to Iranian intelligence and she admitted that in August of 2020, less that be a year before the kidnapping plot came to light, they met in Khazein's office in Tehran.

The government has not and does not allege that the defendant had specific knowledge of the kidnapping plot, but to be crystal clear, there is no dispute that she knew exactly who she was helping. She is no unwitting participant in her

years-long, repeated, and flagrant violation of the sanctions laws.

That is also far from her only crime. The defendant also was charged with bank and wire fraud, money laundering, and structuring, the last of which she was convicted. She amassed significant unexplained wealth and made concerted efforts to hide that wealth through structured deposits.

Between approximately July of 2020 and May of 2021, she made over a hundred cash deposits totaling nearly half a million dollars.

Structuring, like IEEPA, may sound like a sanitized technical term, but here's the point. More than a hundred times the defendant willingly, knowingly, and obviously broke the law when she thought no one was looking, and she amassed significant wealth that remains unexplained.

The government took all this into account when fashioning an appropriate plea offer. The defendant was not required to plead to bank and wire fraud, decreasing her maximum sentencing exposure from 30 years to 20 years. And the government recognized, through mitigating role adjustment, her relatively less culpable role in committing the IEEPA violation. The resulting guidelines range of 46 to 57 months' imprisonment reflects that considered judgment and it reflects the seriousness of the crime here.

A guidelines sentence is appropriate in this case and

it's appropriate because it reflects the seriousness of the defendant's offenses, it provides just punishment, and it sends a message of general deterrence that assisting malign foreign governments can have devastating consequences, including for those targeted by hostile regimes for retribution, people like Masih Alinejad, that those who knowingly provide support and services to those governments, like Iran, will be held to account for their vital role in exporting terror, violence, and repression to the United States, that we will not allow it.

Your Honor, for all of those reasons, the government respectfully submits that a guidelines sentence of 46 to 57 months' imprisonment is appropriate and necessary in this case.

THE COURT: Thank you.

So would Ms. Alinejad like to speak today?

MR. GUTWILLIG: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: You are welcome to come to the podium.

MS. ALINEJAD: Your Honor, thank you so much for giving me this opportunity. Especially coming from a country that women cannot be judge, I am very pleased.

My name is Masih Alinejad. I'm an Iran journalist, American journalist, and activist. My statement is made to highlight the impact of actions undertaken by or on behalf of the Islamic Republic.

I was the target of kidnapping plot that was foiled by the F.B.I., but I am not the only victim here—my husband, Kambiz Foroohar, and my two stepchildren.

Physically, I survived. The ones who wanted to kidnap and harm me failed. But the emotional and mental scars and wounds are very, very real. I loved being in America. I felt the safe place ever that I can express myself, when I could enjoy the benefits of freedom of speech, to campaigning for women inside Iran who don't have the freedom to express themselves.

I'm a very strong woman, but they could break me emotionally. They break — they broke me emotionally. This crime left its marks. I no longer feel safe in America. This crime's left its mark, and every day when I walk out in the streets, I have to watch over my shoulder. This crime hurts emotionally, physically, and financially.

My life changed in 2020. That was when the F.B.I. showed me the surveillance photos of myself, my husband, and my two stepchildren. After that, we moved to a series of safe houses. As a result of the plot, we lost our home where we had lived for ten years and stayed in a series of temporary accommodations. We have changed locations many times in the three years. I can assure you that it is not fun living — living out our — living out of suitcases.

For months, I had troubles sleeping; and when I did,

I used to have nightmares. Even to this day, there are times when I wake up in the middle of the night not quite sure as to where I am. I stay still trying to figure out whether I'm back in Iran or still in the United States of America. Even during the day, I sometimes confused the locations of my new safe house.

Our changed circumstances has been traumatic for our children, especially my teenage stepson who is only 16 year old. He spent little time with us. It has been difficult to create a normal home life during the past three years.

Spring is here now, and this is the most difficult part of my life because I really miss the life that I had before this plot. I miss my tree-lined streets in my little corner of Brooklyn and I miss my neighbors who accepted me as one of their own. Every morning, I used to wake up and run down the stairs to drink my coffee in my beautiful garden with my daffodils, my roses, lilies. Yes, I growed roses and I planted sunflowers that climbed more than seven feet tall. You have to visit my garden.

The Islamic Republic forced me to leave my family in Iran. To remind myself what I had lost, I had planted trees and I named them after my mother, after my father, after my brothers. They are beautiful trees about the members of my family in my garden. Now I have been forced to leave my family once again.

Beside the emotional pain, which is difficult, there is also financial cost. We are forced to put our home up for sale. We have already given most of our furniture to charity.

The hardship will not deter me from my mission at all. The Islamic Republic wanted to silence me, but they have failed. Thanks to the law enforcement and their incredible job, I'm louder than ever.

Islamic Republic is a brutal and repressive regime that kidnaps, tortures, and murders dissidents. The regime has killed thousands of Iranians, innocent protesters at home and hundreds of dissidents outside its borders. Many women received lashes, being raped in prison, and my crime is just giving voice to them. It is beyond belief for anyone—anyone—to claim that they were unaware of the evil nature of the Islamic Republic.

I want this Court to impose the maximum sentence not for my pain, not the pain that I have suffered, not the pain that my family suffered, but to send a signal, a message that you cannot commit acts of terrorism or fund act of terrorism on U.S. soil. I want New York be safe again for me. I want to go back to my neighbors.

Thank you so much for giving me the opportunity to express myself.

THE COURT: Thank you so much for being here today.

MS. ALINEJAD: Thank you.

THE COURT: Mr. Lichtman, would you like to be heard?
MR. LICHTMAN: Yes, Judge.

Your Honor, this is a very unusual case and a very unusual defendant for a variety of reasons.

First, it is very rare that we have a case in which the harm or the potential harm in this case, although as Ms. Alinejad noted, this is real harm even if the plot failed. This evil plot, my client, Ms. Bahadorifar, is now the face of it in America, is now the face of it in this courtroom, and she wasn't convicted of that plot. And it is so rare to have a situation where this is the tail that's wagging the dog to the extreme. If the other defendants that are safely ensconced in Iran right now were in this courtroom being sentenced, she is a minor part of it. She wasn't convicted. She wasn't even charged. But here we are, and it's human nature to direct the ire at the one person that's left, that was able to be punished.

I want to note also that where this defendant came from, what she's been through as a person, what she's experienced to get here today, it's affected her behavior that landed her here. This isn't somebody who grew up in a bad neighborhood in New York, where people were selling drugs and she's got PTSD. This is someone who grew up in a way that is different than -- I don't know if there is any defendant that I have represented -- I have been doing this now for almost 33

years, and this is just an incredibly unusual case.

She was shaped by the Iranian terror regime that took over, that overthrew the country when she was five years old. The country went from a secular, modern, beautiful place to a dark, repressive, evil, murderous terror regime overnight; where one day girls are walking around wearing skirts, listening to music, and the next day if they show an ankle in public, they are beaten by a morality police. It is incredible, but it's true. And I don't know that Americans really appreciate how diseased this Iranian terror regime is and what they have done to the people that they have imprisoned.

So when she was five years old, her entire life changed and she grew up under that repressive regime. As she said in her presentence interview, in her culture, you just take what the men do and you don't report anything. And it sounds like an excuse but it's not.

When she was beaten by her fundamentalist husband in Canada, an arranged marriage, she didn't go to the police.

Why? She is in Canada. She is free. She wasn't in Iran anymore. She didn't do a thing. She was lucky to escape with her life with her son. That's because of where she grew up and the impression that she had from the horrifying experience of growing up as a young girl in Iran.

So I think trying to pigeonhole Ms. Bahadorifar as a

typical American defendant is wrong and unfair. Her reactions to authority, her responses to what people in power ask of her, all of these things separate her from a typical American defendant. And there is no excuse for breaking the law. I'm not using that as an excuse, Judge. But her upbringing, the factors that shaped her world view, are all pertinent pursuant to Section 3553(a).

She's had a very difficult life, as I have said. To watch this happen when you are a young child — and it's something Americans can't understand. You know, I view this case, I'm somebody who personally knows a lot about this society and I have studied it and it fascinates me. Why the courtroom is not filled with international press about this case tells me all I need to know about Americans just don't have any interest or enough interest for whatever reason and Americans should.

She talks about in the presentence report and in some of the letters that were submitted about what happened to her when she was ten years old and she went to a wedding, her sister's wedding, I believe. It's incredible. There were people that were together dancing, men and women. That happens at every wedding. But what happened at the end of the wedding, the morality police came in and arrested everybody because you are not allowed to have men and women that aren't married together in the same room and, God forbid, dancing.

She was ten years old, taken to a police station and then released. That's the kind of thing that shapes your world view, and I don't know that you can ever escape from even when you come to a free country, whether it's Canada or America.

We learned that her father brought her older sister

Azita to America to get educated because her father knew that
this was not the Iran that he grew up in. He knew that,
having three daughters, there was no chance that they could
ever prosper under that regime where there was no value at all
for women, none, just abuse.

Her father was rewarded for his concern for his daughter by being arrested upon his return to Iran and all the family's property was taken. Other relatives were imprisoned. One of them was executed, an uncle, for talking against the regime.

The defendant, as I said, finally escaped Iran and moved to Canada. And as I had said, she didn't escape her upbringing. She was into -- forced into an arranged marriage and had to leave after being beaten and abused. She was told that if she left the house uncovered she would be beaten. This is in Canada. This is what she experienced. And again, as she said, in her culture you just take what the men do and you don't report anything.

Eventually she escaped and moved to America with her young son, Yasha, after seeing him get abused by her husband

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

as well. She had no money. She didn't speak the language barely. It was a new country. She was raising a young boy on her own without any help, without any relatives, with an ex-husband who had nothing to do with her son.

Yasha, her son—you have read his letter, Judge—is now 20 and somehow throughout all of this has turned out to be a wonderful kid. I read the letter, and I would hope that my children would speak about me in the same way as Yasha spoke about his mother, who sacrificed so much to raise him. In his letter to the Court, he described what a tremendous mother she was. As I said, being a single mother in a strange country with no money, no assistance from her ex, her family under siege in Iran, well, that's something. And raising a son by herself under these circumstances, without any kind of upbringing that could prepare her for this new life, is really extraordinary. The letter details their close relationship as they really only have each other in this world. That's it after all these years. Yasha will attend Penn State in the fall and hopes to go to U.S.C. law school. He hopes to be -he hopes to be a criminal defense attorney.

So we are to think that this woman—who by all accounts is a good person, a generous person, who cares for the homeless on the weekend—is somehow embedded with the Iranian terror regime. She is not. The government surely would have provided intelligence upon her if she was. It's

not like the American government is not aware of who is in their midst when they are coming from perhaps America's worst enemy. They have files on all the people, Judge, especially the expatriots from Iran.

Yes, she was involved with a bad person—no question—this Mahmoud Khazein, who had known her for years since she was a young woman, knew her family well before she knew her -- knew him. Yes, she did what he asked of her.

He was not only an authority figure to her, and she's known him for so long, he was also an important government figure in Iran. He is part of Iranian — Iran's terror regime. There is no question. That's not disputed. He is part of the Revolutionary Guard, Judge, and that's their military wing of the Iranian government, and part of their task is to crush any dissent within Iran. This is a very scary terror leader in a country run by the most dangerous terrorists on the planet. Khazein makes people disappear.

But there is zero evidence that Nellie had any clue about this kidnapping plot of Ms. Alinejad, a woman whose hatred of the Iranian terror regime is completely founded. We should all feel the same way about Iran as Ms. Alinejad does. She is a hero for getting it all out. Well, she is a victim, as well. I'm not saying that they are the same, but there is a reason why she is in California. There is a reason why there is an entire community of ex-Iranians there—to escape the

terror regime.

Did she do things, Nellie, for financial need for this man? As noted in the government's submission on page 8, in 2014, Nellie inquired about money she was supposed to receive from family members in Iran and from Khazein. This was just a bit after she fled her ex-husband in Canada.

Regarding Khazein, did she feel morally obligated to help this older authority figure? was she afraid not to help him? I suppose a combination of all. I don't know that we are ever going to get the answer. I don't know that we as Americans can fully understand her motivation. But, Judge, I also can't understand as an American why a 19-year-old who finally escaped Iran would enter into an arranged marriage with a fundamentalist lunatic abusive husband. I can't understand that either. But this is what happens when you grow up in Iran. It's not so easy to shed all of the bad.

She did know that she had family back in Iran who were exposed when all of this was going on. And the government knows full well -- and I can tell you this, Judge, I don't want there to even be a hint that I have any problems with the government's handling of this case. These two prosecutors couldn't have been more fair, more patient, and more decent throughout this entire episode, couldn't be. They were perfect representatives of this office. But as I said, the government knew that she didn't have a thing to do with

the horrible kidnapping plot. They read every one of her thoughts in her texts and her What's App messages or e-mails, nothing about the kidnapping.

She made a payment of \$670 by PayPal to the private investigator and put Mr. Khazein's name in the memo, Judge. He was a known quantity to the U.S. government at that point as a member of the IRGC and she put his name in the PayPal payment memo. She clearly knew nothing of the plot, and she didn't even attempt to hide his name on the memo. That speaks volumes.

And why was Nellie chosen by Khazein? Because he felt he could manipulate her. That's why. He felt he could get her to do his bidding unknowing what he was actually doing. If he was dealing with someone who was ideologically aligned with him, Judge, with the Iranian terror regime, he would have included her in on the plot. He didn't. He never did.

THE COURT: Don't I have to send a message to people just like Ms. Bahadorifar, who can be manipulated, to say this is what's going to happen?

MR. LICHTMAN: Judge, I'm going to tell you what the message is that may have already been sent, regardless of what happens today, that doesn't happen to a defendant in a regular case. This woman, who was living in a close-knit expat community in Iran [sic] is marked. Why? Because everybody in

her community thinks she is aligned with the Iranian terror regime. In her building, where she lived with friends, they are all Iranian. This is what they do. They went to be with each other because they understand each other and they all experienced the same up bringing. Now she is mud. Her picture is put up in the elevator. Most of the people won't speak to her. She was fired from her job. That's the first part. Where can she go? Is she going to move to Kansas City? Is she going to move as if she is in the witness protection program? No. No. She can't. She's got roots there, and now she is hated there, even though she herself was manipulated by Khazein and is an opponent of that regime, which is why she got out. That's part one.

Part two, well, she is marked by the Iranian terror regime as well. You have read our papers, Judge. You know what they are. You know what they are capable of. You know what they have done. There is nothing beneath this diseased terror regime. And the idea that she is somehow not in danger herself, or her family, from these people is ludicrous to suggest otherwise.

So has a message been sent? She's got a felony conviction. She is hated by both sides of the equation here and she was manipulated. There is no question. Period. And as I said, she finds herself in a world of trouble. She is the only defendant who will ever appear before an American

judge in this case. The others are carefully hidden and protected in Iran. They are not feeling any pain today. And the one person who was not charged with the plot is here to take the brunt of it.

This is a terror regime, Judge, and I know I have gone on about it, but she has family that's stuck in Iran right now, exposed. This is a regime that has killed, tortured and imprisoned so many innocent Iranians just in the past few months because a 22-year-old Kurdish Iranian woman named Mahsa Amini dared to wear a loose head covering in public, and for that she needed to be beaten to death by Iran's morality police.

Since then, they have had protests in the streets there and the world has watched in horror at the brutal tactics employed to crush it—murder, arrests with no trials, torture, rape, electrocution, removal of nails. If you simply dance in the street in Iran, you are attacked by the morality police.

And you would think that by now that they would want to reach some sort of accommodation with the people that are uprising. No. Last week Iran's chief justice warned that women who did not cover their heads in public will be punished and prosecuted without mercy. This evil regime has taken to poisoning young school girls to prevent them from protesting. Thousands have been poisoned already.

The government wrote in its letter that Congress recently enumerated over a dozen alleged plots by the government of Iran over recent years to bomb, shoot, kidnap, harass, and gather intelligence against victims in the United States, Canada, the U.K., France, Germany, Denmark, Turkey, and Africa. Judge, that's a fraction.

How about the last 24 hours? We've got Iran paying terrorists in Lebanon. They have killed the prime minister. They bankrupted the country. They are shooting rockets into Israel. We have got Iran's Hamas terrorists below Israel shooting rockets into Israel. I read that there was a plot of two Iranian operatives who were arrested in Azerbaijan yesterday for trying to overthrow the government. Why? They want to install a Shi'a government. This is how utterly sick this is.

The day that I filed our sentencing letter, there was an arrest of Iranian operatives who were about to target a Jewish center in Greece, in Athens, in a crowded area, not an Israeli target. This wasn't an issue with politics. They are anti-Semites and they wanted to kill Jews in Greece.

Similarly, they have a cartoon contest every year about the Holocaust and the best one that says that the Holocaust didn't occur, well, that's your big winner. That's what we have with Iran.

There is nothing that deters this terror

regime—nothing. So that's the message -- and I went on about it, but that's the message that she faces as well. When this is over, Judge, whatever your Honor does, it doesn't end it for her. It doesn't end it for her in America, it doesn't end it for her anywhere. It doesn't end it for her with her expats and it doesn't end it for her with the people that are coming into this country to kill and kidnap.

During the pendency of this case they tried to kill Ms. Alinejad again. A man was arrested with an AK-47 who was at her front door during the pendency of this case. That shows they don't have any concern. They tried to kill Mike Pompeo and John Bolton. They have no concern at all. They are certainly not going to be deterred from going after the defendant.

And when the government reports the defendant initially lied to law enforcement officers who arrested her about her relationship with Mahmoud Khazein, should that be any surprise, an Iranian woman afraid to admit any relationship with a member of the Revolutionary Guard when she has family back trapped in Iran?

And I'm going to come to the end, Judge. If we can get past the politics and the need to send a message, I get all of that. I think that's one thing that we can all agree upon in this courtroom is that somebody, somehow there has to

be a message sent to this terror regime. I would ask you to look at her life, Ms. Bahadorifar, when no one was watching, when she had no need to impress the Court or anyone, for that matter. This is a person who gives back to her community.

I have got clients, Judge, they get arrested, they are incredibly wealthy, and they say to me the first time we had a meeting in my office, well, who could I write a check to to show that I am a charitable person for a judge down the line? It happens, like, I don't know, like 80 percent of the time.

She doesn't have any money. What she did is, by her sweat equity, she is helping the homeless, she is feeding them on weekends. There is no matter, no situation too small for her not to try to help her friends, her community. She listens. She acts. The letters are legion in that regard, legion in her charity.

And this is why she is so ashamed to be here today, because she loves America. She didn't come here as an operative. She came here to raise her son in freedom. We forget about that because she is here as a criminal defendant. This is a horrible ironic tragedy for her.

In conclusion, it is an unusual case for all the reasons I have said. She is the face of the Iranian terror regime that she had no part of in this courtroom today. As I said and you know, she wasn't charged with that horrible part

of the case. She was misled, lied to by a long-time family friend, the scary authority figure who is in the Iranian Revolutionary Guard. But she stills committed the crimes. She should have known better. Could she ever have imagined that she was getting herself involved in this? Of course not. She would have been charged. And she is mortified by what she did.

And after such a difficult life, Judge, from an awful childhood, growing up, first, in this idyllic country, and then by age five her world turned upside-down when the revolution occurred. Suddenly, she is a second class citizen in an Islamic terror state. She finally escaped, only to find herself in another prison in Canada with a fundamentalist abuser. When she finally escaped and moved to America, a country that gave her peace and freedom, against all odds she raised, on her own, a wonderful son without speaking the language well, but she persevered.

But, sadly, the damage of her upbringing was done, caused her to be manipulated by an authority figure who was a powerful member of Iran's terror regime government. But she knew better. America gave her so much, and she knew better.

And now she is going to pay the price for this, for her actions for the rest of her life, Judge. She will always have people -- she will always have to look over her shoulder from both sides of this equation. She will have difficulty

ever working again here, certainly not in her area where she lives. She still must raise a son who relies -- raise a son who relies on her completely.

For all these reasons, Judge -- and I know that it is a difficult decision for you. I don't envy me. When I walked in this morning, I was feeling bad, I was feeling bad for myself because this is --

THE COURT: Speak into the mic please so we can all hear you.

MR. LICHTMAN: -- because this is a case that tears at me personally, as well. It's something that I have a passion about, and it's very hard to be here and it's very hard to represent a woman who I feel it's so easy to make her bear the brunt of what occurred here, and she is the only one that ever will, and she is by far the least involved and was wasn't charged in the main crime.

For all those reasons, Judge, I know that it is not easy for you, but I beg of you to give her another chance, to give her a probationary sentence with home confinement with as much community service, to speak to other people, whatever your Honor can do. I don't want to break up this small family, what's left of it.

Thank you, Judge.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Ms. Bahadorifar, would you like to say something

today?

THE DEFENDANT: Yes.

THE COURT: Bring the microphone a little closer, please, so we can all hear you.

THE DEFENDANT: Your Honor, I would like to sincerely apologize to this beautiful country, the Honorable Court, the prosecutor, to my fiancé Salman, as well as my son Yasha and my sister and the brave people of Iran. I'm deeply sorry that my crime brought so much discomfort into their lives. To Ms. Alinejad, I'm humiliated to have been involved in any attempt to harm you, even I was unaware of it. You are a hero to all Iranian, and especially me and my family. I'm deeply sorry. I'm sorry.

I moved to United States from Iran to finally experience freedom and happiness and finally have a better life. The United States has provide me with freedom I had never experienced in Iran. The United States is the country that does so much for their people and that is why I am beyond ashamed for doing this to my new home which has done nothing but support me, keep me safe, provide me with equal rights as everyone else. Again, these are all things that everyone in Iran would dream of having it. I promise to never, ever let this country down in any way again.

And to Yasha my son, we have been through so much together. We have overcome so much. I never wanted to let

you down, and now I have. I am so sorry. Please forgive me.

Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you.

Is there any reason that sentence cannot be imposed at this time?

MR. GUTWILLIG: No, your Honor.

MR. LICHTMAN: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So I'm required to consider the advisory guidelines range as well as various other factors that are outlined in a provision of the law that I mentioned earlier—it's 18 United States Code § 3553(a)—and I have done so. Those factors include, but are not limited to, the nature and circumstances of the offense and the personal history and characteristics of the defendant, because each defendant must be considered individually as a person.

Judges are also required to consider the need for the sentence imposed to reflect the seriousness of the offense, promote respect for the law, provide just punishment for the offense, afford adequate deterrence to criminal conduct, protect the public from future crimes of the defendant, and avoid unwarranted sentencing disparities, among other things.

You know, sentencing is the hardest thing that a judge does. It is immeasurably difficult for a human being to judge another human being and decide if they should be deprived of their liberty and, if so, for how long.

This sentencing is particularly difficult in my view because I have before me a woman who is sympathetic in many respects. She has no criminal history. She is beloved by friends and family, and she has faced many serious challenges in her life. But she has also engaged in criminal conduct that is not only egregious in and of itself, but conduct through which she endangered the life of another woman, a woman who, in contrast to Ms. Bahadorifar, is a profile of courage in the face of the Iranian terror regime.

I think the Probation Department put it so well in the presentence report when it said that almost all organized criminal activity depends on individuals like Bahadorifar, people with clean criminal records and unassuming backgrounds who are unlikely to attract attention. These individuals provide access to the U.S. financial system to bad actors. They obfuscate the source of money and allow it to be transferred for nefarious purposes—in this case, sanctions evasion and a kidnapping plot.

The purpose of the United States's sanctions on Iran is to put economic and political pressure to achieve a peaceful desired outcome, namely, preventing Iran's proliferation of nuclear weapons and stopping their continued support for terrorist groups throughout the Middle East without having to go to war. If Iran can avoid these sanctions, as they are trying to do with the help of people

like Bahadorifar, then sanctions will be ineffective and the risk of war increases.

The kidnapping plot on American soil is an affront to our national sovereignty, the values of democracy, and the rule of law. Bahadorifar played a relatively small role in all this and yet her contribution was crucial.

Here, Ms. Bahadorifar had known the Iranian intelligence actor for years and understood him to be affiliated with Iranian intelligence services. Indeed, she met with him in Tehran in August 2020 when he was engaged in the plot to kidnap, even though she didn't know about that plot. But nonetheless, knowing what she did, what Ms. Bahadorifar knew, she still provided an attempt to provide this man assistance for a full nine-year period, from 2012 to 2021.

Moreover, the amount of funds involved in the structuring charge is close to half a million dollars. In just the two-year period between 2019 and 2021, much of that time at the height of the pandemic lockdown, the defendant made over 100 separate trips to make cash deposits at banks specifically intended to evade reporting requirements. Those 102 deposits totaled well over \$400,000 in illicit funds.

And she profited from this scheme. When the F.B.I. searched her home, they found about \$150,000 in luxury goods, including watches and handbags and jewelry. So not only does

a sentence in this case have to reflect the seriousness of the offenses, but I have to send a strong message to deter other people like Ms. Bahadorifar from engaging in conduct like this and hopefully prevent dangers like those that befell Ms. Alinejad who has been so brave not only in coming here today but in speaking up against injustice in her homeland.

So while I have considered all of the arguments made by Ms. Bahadorifar, including but not limited to her lack of criminal history and her health issues, and I read every one of the many letters submitted by her friends and her family who describe her in glowing terms, and while I am fully cognizant that there is no evidence that she knowingly participated in the kidnapping plot, a very serious sentence must nonetheless be imposed, and I ultimately agree with the government that one within the guidelines range is appropriate.

Ms. Bahadorifar, could you please rise for the imposition of sentence.

It is the judgment of this Court that you be committed to the custody of the Bureau of Prisons for a term of 48 months on each count to run concurrently, to be followed by a term of supervised release of three years on each count also to run concurrently.

I believe that this four-year sentence is sufficient but not greater than necessary to comply with the purposes of

sentencing set forth in the law. And just to be clear, you know, based on the facts before me, I would have imposed the same sentence however I ruled on the guidelines issue that we discussed earlier.

You can be seated while I describe the conditions of your supervised release.

So all of the standard conditions of supervised release shall apply. They are on pages 25 through 27 of the presentence report. Counsel, would you like me at the read these aloud or do you waive their public reading?

MR. LICHTMAN: Judge, we waive the public reading.

THE COURT: I will say the mandatory conditions on the record.

You must not commit another federal, state, or local crime.

You must not unlawfully possess a controlled substance. You must refrain from any unlawful use of a controlled substance.

You must cooperate in the collection of DNA as directed by the probation officer, and you must make restitution in accordance with the law.

In light of the nature of the crime, I'm also taking the recommendation of the probation department and requiring you to provide the probation officer with access to any requested financial information, and you must not incur any

new credit card charges or open additional lines of credit without the approval of the probation officer unless you are in compliance with the installment payment schedule.

I am not going to impose a fine at the recommendation of the probation department and in light of the amount of forfeiture that I intend to order.

I am imposing the special mandatory special assessment of \$200, which shall be paid immediately.

So a consent preliminary order of forfeiture money judgment was issued on December 15, 2022 in the amount of \$476,100. That order will become part of the judgment in this case.

Is the government separately seeking restitution?

MR. GUTWILLIG: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. So none will be imposed.

Is there any objection to voluntary surrender?

MR. GUTWILLIG: Your Honor, the government's position is that remand is appropriate under the applicable standard. I don't think that the defendant can meet her burden to establish that she is not by clear and convincing evidence a flight risk. I think this is because, among other things, the nature and circumstances of this offense, the amount of money, the illicit payments, the deceptive means used for that, and I think that the distinguishing factor between today and when she pled guilty is that your Honor has just imposed a

significant sentence that incentivizes flight.

THE COURT: Counsel, would you like to be heard?

MR. LICHTMAN: Judge, we have known about these sentencing guidelines for a long time now. The idea that she is a flight risk is ludicrous. She could have left any time beforehand. It would be a lot easier for her to have left before she even pled guilty in this case.

She followed every single directive from Pretrial Services. There was not a single issue. So the idea of what more could be clear and convincing evidence? This is beyond a reasonable doubt evidence that she is no flight risk. She's got family here. She's got a son who is in school who will be going to school in the fall. The idea that she is going to run away when she's got a four-year sentence and when you factor in the 85 percent, the halfway house, and the First Step Act credits, it's about 29 months in jail.

The idea that she is going to leave this country to go where and leave her family is, frankly, a joke, and I would ask that she be given 90 days to self-surrender—she's got a son who is still in school, he is going to be transferring to another school this fall—to give him an opportunity to get him straight, Judge. That's all they have is each other. There is not one single scintilla of evidence that suggests that she is a flight risk here.

THE COURT: All right. I am going to set a voluntary

surrender date. I agree that she is has been compliant throughout on pretrial release at all times. She was well aware of the guidelines range, and I gave a sentence of course within that range, and she does have her son who will be attending school in the United States. And if she were to flee — and consider this a warning, Ms. Bahadorifar, you will be arrested immediately, and then she won't be seeing her son again for a very long time.

Ms. Cavale, could you choose a date approximately 90 days out.

THE DEPUTY CLERK: How is July 7 at 11 a.m.?

MR. LICHTMAN: Thank you.

THE COURT: On that date she shall surrender to the institution designated by the Bureau of Prisons or as notified by the probation or Pretrial Services.

Ms. Bahadorifar, the conditions of your release will continue up until the time that you report for sentence. If you fail to report for sentence. Not only will you be arrested on a bench warrant, but you will likely be charged with a separate crime of bail jumping. So I want to make that very, very clear.

That is the sentence of this Court.

Ms. Bahadorifar, you have a right to appeal your conviction and sentence except to whatever extent you may have validly waived that right as part of your plea agreement. If

24

25

you do choose to appeal, the notice of appeal must be filed 1 2 within 14 days of the judgment of conviction. If you are not able to pay for the cost of an appeal, 3 4 you may apply for leave to appeal in forma pauperis which 5 simply means that court costs, such as filing fees, will be 6 waived. 7 If you request, the Clerk of Court will prepare and 8 file a notice of appeal on your behalf. 9 Is the government moving to dismiss the open counts? 10 MR. GUTWILLIG: Yes, your Honor. 11 THE COURT: All right. They will be dismissed. 12 Are there any other applications? 13 MR. LICHTMAN: Judge, I would ask for a recommendation for a prison camp in central California. 14 15 THE COURT: All right. I will make that recommendation. It's ultimately, of course, up to the Bureau 16 17 of Prisons, but I will make that representation --18 recommendation. 19 MR. LICHTMAN: Thank you. 20 THE COURT: Are there any other applications at this 21 time? 22 MR. LICHTMAN: Nothing from the defense. 23 MR. GUTWILLIG: Not from the government, your Honor.

THE COURT: Thank you. We are adjourned.

000